



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE SWISS AND THEIR POLITICS.¹

I WAS in Switzerland about three months, and I was more than ever impressed with the importance of the position of that country in the making of Europe. The soil of Europe has in large part been ground out of the "raw material" of the mountains of Switzerland. The glaciers that remain are mere toys when compared with those which have been.

Before I left home I read in one of the essays of Emerson expressions on the folly of traveling to gain information, on the part of a man who was so fortunate as to possess a soul. I gathered from Emerson that he found in that transcendental soul of his all, and more than all, that he could gain by change of position. Such has not been my experience. I thought I understood glaciers and glacial action before I saw one, and when I first saw them I was quite ready to felicitate myself upon the accuracy of my mental picture. The first that we visited we were expected to come within a stone's throw of, and pay our respects by looking down upon it from a cliff, and it seemed to me that this was all that was needed. Yet somehow I was seized with a desire to actually touch it. I disregarded the formal restraints and went to the point where the moving stone and ice are in contact with the immovable mountain. I followed along the morain to the end of the ice. I lay down upon the stones and looked under the ice. I got onto the ice and looked down to the bottom through holes that had been burnt through by bowlders. It was thus that I got an idea of the working of the glacier such as I suppose a mere transcendental soul never gets. He thinks he has it; but the chances are he is mistaken. Since seeing the grist of the present little ice

¹This paper was written as a private letter to a member of the faculty of Iowa College. With the author's consent the letter is here reproduced without changes, except the omission of personal references.

mills I have not been able to get away from its effect. In Geneva our house stood on some hundreds of feet of the grindings of an ice mill that amounted to something. It was a body of ice some two hundred miles in length. It had a width varying from ten to a hundred miles. At Geneva this river of ice was squeezed in between mighty pillars, having on the one side Mount Blanc as the highest sentinel, and the Jural Mountains on the other. One result was the plowing out of a hole in the earth which is now occupied by the waters of Lake Geneva. Another result was the reduction of stones broken off from the mountains in pieces as big as houses into pebbles such as boys throw at birds. These pebbles are now exposed, hundreds of feet in depth, on the banks of the Rhone and the Arve. And all the way from Geneva to Paris I observed that what they call the soil is composed in large part of these same pebbles. The mill may have "ground slow" but it did not "grind fine" as did the mills which made for us the soil of Iowa.

As in Switzerland one may see in miniature the making of the soil of Europe, so likewise one may see in miniature the history of Europe. Each one of the twenty-two cantons has a special and peculiar history, which in most cases goes back to the beginning of modern history. In these cantons you have a little Germany, a little Italy, and a little France. Three races and three languages have been kept separate and distinct, yet by the action and inter-action of internal and external forces the three have been compacted into one nation with an *esprit de corps* scarcely equaled by any nation on earth.

It seems to me that any observer from the New World must be struck with the difference in spirit, tone, and method which comes from the mere fact of indigenous civilization. In America we have the case of a transplanted civilization under circumstances most favorable. We do not half appreciate the amount of humbug we get rid of by simply going away from it. Yet there are losses as well. In a new country there is a difficulty in taking anything seriously. We know that out in the Rockies even the graveyard is a sort of standing joke. So one

of the things that has impressed me most in Switzerland is the deep seriousness of their sentimental patriotism. In America we think we do well if we spend a part of one day in the celebration of our Independence. And those whom we call our more serious people are inclined to the opinion that even so much is a waste of time. During the two months of my stay in Geneva, six days and six nights, that is, one-tenth of the entire time, was devoted to patriotic celebration, and that too not on the part of the light and frivolous members of society, but of the most serious members of the community. In 1602, on the night of the 12th of December, a poor washerwoman who lived on the wall of the city was making soup when she discovered some soldiers of the Duke of Savoy in the act of scaling the wall. She hurled her soup upon them and raised the alarm, and the city was successfully defended. This gave rise to the three days' Festival of the Escalade, beginning December 11. For days preceding the date there began to appear in the shop windows soup kettles done in chocolate and wood and all sorts of material bearing the date "1602." Shop windows were filled with masks of all imaginable shapes. Costumes were displayed, some of them very elegant and expensive, others cheap and fantastic. On the evening of the eleventh I went to the Circus, where with about eight thousand other people I sat for three hours in a freezing atmosphere witnessing patriotic performances. I paid 60 cents for my seat, and I think it was an average price. Leading citizens of Geneva took part in the exercises, which consisted in short addresses, songs, marches, dances, while some of it resembled an Iowa College "winter gym." In one scene certain Austrians appeared and strutted up and down the stage in full armor. An equal number of Frenchmen also appeared in shining array. A little later the Swiss came in, whose stalwart muscles were covered only by natural skin and armed only by real war clubs. All performed together *à la* Indian clubs. By a strange coincidence the Austrians and French were surrounded by the Swiss, thrown upon their backs, their arms

wrested from them, and they demurely marched out under the yoke.

Another exercise well represented the spirit of the occasion. First, three athletes appeared, and one on the shoulders of the other two held aloft a card having on one side in large characters the date, 1291, and on the other the word "Alliance." The three men were the original cantons of the confederation of 1291. Next appeared five other athletes, and the eight threw themselves into a ladder displaying a new card with the same word and the date, 1352. Then five more men appeared and with the aid of parallel ropes the thirteen lifted a man toward the roof with the charmed word and the date, 1513. Then five more, and the eighteen lifted a man above the supporting cable with the card and the date 1798. Finally the whole twenty-two lifted a man to the apex of the roof waving aloft "Alliance" and the date 1813. Then was brought in on a platform borne by four of these same stalwarts a lady of Geneva who had consented to pose as Switzerland. The four tenderly bore her up, and the eighteen took their positions around her in the four historic and expressive groups. As these lifted their strong right arms in the attitude of defense the assembled thousands held their breath till "Switzerland" and her defenders passed from the arena, and then they broke forth in loud applause.

You should remember that Geneva only holds about 80,000 people, and while these thousands were paying their respects to Switzerland in the cold Circus many more thousands were assiduously doing their patriotism in the streets. The street performances are about the same during the three nights. When our Geneva friends learned that I intended to spend the second evening in the streets and take my wife and daughter with me, they felt it their duty to forewarn us. They had learned from past experience that English and American ladies do not like to have masked strangers speak to them and greet them as dear and familiar friends; they do not like to be enclosed in a circle of dancing peasants. Our friends gave us to understand that the Genevese do these things because

they feel that it is their duty as patriots. If the English and Americans do not like it they should keep themselves away from the main streets of the city during the three nights of the Escalade. Notwithstanding the friendly warning we spent several hours of the 12th along the main streets in the thickest crowds. And here again I must dissent from Emerson's transcendentalism and express the opinion that it is absolutely impossible to understand the Escalade without experiencing it. I do not profess to understand it, yet I know enough to be well assured that I could not put into words the things we experienced without conveying an erroneous impression as to its spirit and temper.

On the third day, having seen a notice in the paper that the bones of the victims of the defense of the city in 1602 were to be moved to a more honored spot, my wife and I presented ourselves at the appointed place. We were not however permitted to enter the church till the ceremony was over. When we read the account in the paper we felt that we had been attempting to commit sacrilege. No one was permitted to be present except a few chosen and necessary officers and certain representatives of the families of the deceased. I mention this as expressive of the deep seriousness of the patriotism of the people.

Geneva was the last child to be adopted into the family of states. This took place on December 31, 1813. This glad fact is recognized by the citizens assembling at midnight in front of the cathedral of St. Peter. But the space only holds about 20,000 and the other 60,000 are crowded out. My wife and I went early and got a position on the steps of an adjoining building overlooking the crowd. All the space was occupied an hour before the end of the year. The crowd waited a full half hour in the darkness and part of the time in the rain. The instant it began to rain enough umbrellas were whisked out to cover the space. They all expected rain. For a half hour there were patriot songs led by a choir, and when the bell tolled the end of the year the entire crowd fell to kissing each other and the ceremony was at an end. There was nothing about the performance which in the American sense could be considered attractive.

There was a bit of fireworks at the end, in which a star and the date of the new year shone out in brilliant colors. The three days of festivity at the beginning of the year are given over to sports and traffic kept up during all the hours of night and day.

One other significant festival was observed through all Switzerland. On the 11th of January teachers and pupils united in doing honor to their distinguished leader, Pestalozzi, on the occasion of his 150th birthday. It was Pestalozzi who taught the art of making play a serious business. The Swiss were the first subjects of his instruction and they seem to have caught the point a little in advance of the rest of the world.

I was told more than once not to go to Geneva to learn the spirit of the Swiss, that Geneva is more French than Swiss, that the Genevese were wanting in loyalty to the Swiss nation. Speaking simply from my own impressions I should say that if this is true of the Genevese the loyalty of the other cantons must be something terrific.

Another thing that interested me very much in Geneva—and so far as I could learn this is characteristic throughout Switzerland—was the marked respect shown for the private opinion of the individual voter. During my first two Sundays in Geneva I attended important elections. The first was on the *Referendum* to accept or reject an act of the national legislature reorganizing the military forces in the direction of greater centralization. The second was a triennial election to choose a central legislature. I had learned from the local papers that in the case of both of these elections there was unusual public interest. I had also attended elections in England and America. On election day both in England and America we expect every citizen to do his duty, and we mean as one part of that duty not only that he should vote early but that he should spend the rest of the day in the effort to induce his friends to vote, and to vote the right ticket. We mention with special honor the names of our conservative ministers of the gospel who thus attend to the duties of election day. When I entered the large hall which contained the Genevese voters, I expected

to see evidences that the good citizens were doing their duty. But I learned to my surprise that what we especially mean by electioneering is a thing almost unknown among the Swiss. The crowds about the voting places were quietly talking about the weather, about their families, about the exposition. There was no reason why they should talk about the election, because it was considered entirely improper to try to persuade a citizen to vote a certain way. The citizen thus addressed would feel insulted. Two rival candidates would meet by chance in the crowd. For personal reasons they would naturally allude to the election. In a perfectly frank and straightforward way they would discuss their prospects. As there was no electioneering anywhere there was no motive for lying about the probable result of the election. A would say to his rival, "I expect you to be elected by 900 majority." B would reply, "I don't think so; I expect a close vote with almost even chances." It will not do to apply this conversation to the election which I attended. It is my recollection of the report of a conversation at another election. At the election which I attended the system of proportional representation was followed, and strictly speaking there were no rival candidates. I report the conversation simply to show the spirit which seemed everywhere to prevail.

In 1865 there occurred an election in Geneva in which there must have prevailed a different spirit, because at the close of the election the members of the conservative party, who were victorious at that election, undertook to give expression to their feelings by marching through the streets. The procession was attacked by the Radicals; deadly weapons were used and fifteen men were killed. This one event seems to have thrown the Genevese into a pensive state of mind from which they have never recovered. My escort to the first election alluded to it in such a way as to give me the impression that it occurred only a few years ago. Thoughtful people became convinced that unless something were done to break the force of party violence and give to the people the real management of their affairs,

democratic government was an impossibility. At that time John Stuart Mill and Mr. Hare were advocating proportional representation as one means of escape from the dominance of party factions. A few citizens of Geneva became convinced that proportional representation along with the *referendum* and popular initiative in legislation was just the thing they needed to complete their democratic system of government. So in 1868, three years after the bloody riot, a society was organized to advocate the adoption of proportional representation. Professor Wuarin of the chair of sociology in the Geneva University has been a prominent factor in this propaganda, and he told me many interesting things about it. It was a good illustration of the "faith as a grain of mustard seed which removes mountains."

There were only a half dozen or so who could be got to take any active interest in the subject. According to Professor Wuarin's account a large proportion of the real work was done by a citizen of Geneva who makes a living by selling ribbons. For a quarter of a century this little society labored with no apparent success. Three years ago in the little Italian canton of Ticino the Catholics and Protestants were ready to cut each other's throats over a political quarrel, and they were induced to accept proportional representation as a means of deliverance. Two cantons followed and the promoters of the reform are well assured that all the cantons will adopt it in the near future. I do not write this to give you any information as to the nature or the merits of proportional representation. It has been well written up in our American magazines. I allude to it for the special purpose of illustrating my observation of the marked respect which the Swiss show for the private opinion of the voter. Here is a little society which has spent a quarter of a century in persuading a nation to adopt a radical change in political methods. Men do not do a thing like that who are not in dead earnest about it. After twenty-six years a canton had been induced to go so far as to submit the question of the adoption of proportional representation to a vote of the people. How do you suppose that little group of men who had for so many years been

giving time and money and strength to the cause would spend that election day? I asked Professor Wuarin squarely whether at such an election he and his friends would not single out voters whom they might reasonably hope to influence and try to persuade them to vote their ticket. As I remember his reply; it was: "No, we would not do that for fear of injuring our cause. It is assumed that before election day each voter has his mind made up. It is counted an impertinence to seek to disturb him or to change his conclusion. They seem to actually assume that the other fellow is also a patriot and should be left free to act upon his own convictions.

In my transcendental view of Switzerland I had the impression that democracy in that land was old, that it was somehow indigenous to the soil and oozed out of the rocks. I have been led to make important modifications of that view. In some of the communes and cantons there exists that which is very old and which it is natural to describe as democratic. There were communal lands, communal pastures and forests. There were assemblies of all the freemen to attend to matters of common concern. Certainly this fulfills the ordinary definition of democracy, yet it may fairly be doubted whether our concept of this ancient Alpine democracy is not entirely misleading. We unconsciously take into our definition of democracy the idea of conscious free social action. It may well be questioned whether these early mountain democrats were possessed of any such consciousness; whether they were not rather victims of democratic habits. By farming together, fighting together and herding together on equal terms they could live. By acting in any other way they would die. These regions at no time have been cursed with a surplus of the means of living. Their democratic ways and the so-called democratic virtues were the only obvious means of subsistence. All this, of course, is more theory. But there can be no doubt of the fact that when these same mountain Swiss were led to take a part in government outside of the ancient beaten track they manifested no special predilection for democracy. Government in the cantons drifted into the hands of the few. As early

as 1513 there was a sort of confederacy of thirteen cantons. But this confederacy was not a government, certainly it was not a democratic government. The thirteen were prevented from breaking up into warring states from the fact that they held the greater part of the land outside their own borders which now composes Switzerland as subject territory. The subject territory was governed in a way altogether anti-democratic. The French Revolution loosened the joints of despotism in Switzerland as it did in the rest of Europe. It was not until Switzerland was conquered by France and organized as a Helvetic province that all of the cantons were placed in relations of equality with reference to each other. It was outside pressure on the part of the monarchies of Europe that forced the thirteen despotic cantons to a position of equality when Switzerland became independent in 1813. But the old aristocratic governments remained. The revolutions of 1830 stirred the democratic impulses in Switzerland, but it was not until the period of European revolution in 1846 and 1848 that a really democratic constitution was adopted in Switzerland. Of course I knew these historic facts before I went to Switzerland, but I had failed to be duly impressed with the newness of Swiss democracy. I believe that we cannot be too prompt in reaching the understanding that what we now recognize as democracy is something absolutely new on the face of the earth. The name and the thing democracy were a byword and a scandal to many of our revolutionary fathers. In Switzerland the men still live who have witnessed a short and sudden change from a close oligarchy or aristocracy to democracy. These men know when and how the change was made. With us the ideas of Jefferson have filtered into our minds so gradually and imperceptibly as to delude us into the notion that all true patriots have always been democrats.

The party in Switzerland which represents the ruling class of 1848 is now called the Democratic party. It has in it the bankers, merchants, and men of conservative tendencies. Yet this party has initiated and carried into effect legislation which in America would be stigmatized as communistic. Some, if not

all, of the original promoters of proportional representation are conservatives in politics. The man who led the conservatives to victory at the time of the riot in 1865 is a banker. He was afterwards made President of the Confederation. As a member of the government of the canton and of the Confederacy he was the author and the promoter of the various reforms in taxation. These reforms all had for their object the taxation of the few rich people for the benefit of the middle classes and the poor. There is the progressive income tax, which exempts small incomes, rests lightly on medium incomes, and is very heavy upon large incomes. And then the progressive feature is worked into all forms of taxation. Property owners are divided into five or six classes, according to the value of their property. Those owning little property are taxed at low rate. This rate is progressively raised, and it becomes quite high for the most wealthy. There is also a death tax, or a tax on estates of the deceased, which has the progressive feature. You will find these systems explained in the consular reports from Switzerland. But you will fail to get the real point if you are not careful to bear in mind that it takes but little money in Switzerland to constitute a rich man. The rate of taxation ceases to progress, because there are no rich men higher up. To apply the principle to America we should have to write dollars in place of francs in the lower scale, double the dollars for the higher scale, and then create new classes for the wealthier Americans.

This Swiss system of laying heavy burdens on the few for the benefit of the many is not only law; it is law thoroughly and rigidly executed. The laws seem to have been made by the rich men themselves with the definite intention of doing the things named in the law. The laws have been made with the idea of permanence. There is no thought of a mere temporary expedient to overcome a temporary difficulty. These rich men who have taken the lead in fastening heavy burdens on themselves and upon their children seem to really believe that the thing which they have done is just and right. When I have

tried to explain to some of them that such measures in America were regarded as socialistic or communistic in their tendency they have thrown their heads back and indulged in a loud horselaugh. The idea that the bankers and merchants and manufacturers of Switzerland should be accused of communism seemed to them supremely ridiculous. As the wealthy Swiss look upon the men of their own class they are convinced that they are better able to pay taxes than are the men of less ample fortunes. It seems to them perfectly natural and right that their superior ability should be duly recognized in the system of direct taxation. It would be difficult to make Americans believe this ; but it would be more difficult to cause the Swiss to understand our American plutocracy. The wealthy Swiss, who thirty years ago determined to establish a system of taxation such as I have described, had had actual experience of two radically different kinds of government. Until 1848 they and their class had ruled Switzerland for three hundred years. Then there was a decade or two during which this class fared badly at the elections. The cynic, of course, is sure to say that they took the Democratic name and bound heavy burdens upon themselves for mere prudential reasons to avoid a worse fate, and the cynic may be correct as to the matter of ancient history ; but thirty years of this sort of acting has important consequences. At any rate there can be no doubt that now the wealthy classes in Switzerland accept as just and right the paying of a higher rate of taxation than the less wealthy.

I met a lawyer in Geneva who had lived in New York City, who has a brother now practicing law in New York. A large part of the business of this lawyer is for Americans. He has for twenty years been the attorney for the American Consul at Geneva, and has been the attorney for Americans having business interests in Geneva. His position has been such as to enable him to make comparisons between the two countries. He expressed the utmost astonishment at the dominance of the money power in America. He said it was incomprehensible to him how a country founded by such men

as George Washington should ever come to be so completely ruled by money. He gave vent to these expressions before he knew anything about my sentiments. When he found that I too had some fears about the power of money in American politics he seemed surprised and pleased. He hoped that these dangers might be effectively brought before the people and the lawmakers in America, so that free institutions might be preserved in the Great Republic.

I have been surprised at the cool and matter-of-fact way in which the Swiss, through their governmental agencies, assume control of industrial operations which Americans regard as belonging to private enterprise. The Swiss were among the first to adopt the government telegraph. This suited them so well that when the telephone had fully demonstrated its usefulness, without any special debate or fuss about the matter, they made the telephone an integral part of the postal-telegraphic system. For about \$9 one has the use of a telephone for a year, with connections in all parts of the city and country. They have a parcels post which corresponds to our express business. It cost me 5 cents to send by mail my manuscript on the English Government from one end of Switzerland to the other. For a like service in the United States mail I think I have paid 75 cents. It is only recently that measures have been adopted looking to the government ownership of all the railways of Switzerland, and I have been completely dumfounded at the apparent lack of interest in the subject. There is no debate, no newspaper discussion. You introduce the subject to an intelligent, patriotic citizen who ought to be profoundly stirred by such a revolutionary measure; and he would show that he was fully aware of the fact that in a few years the government would own the railways, while yet there seemed to him nothing in the event worthy of special remark. The government has recently taken charge of the manufacture and sale of matches. I think the government monopoly of the sale of alcoholic drinks has excited more debate. But the point of interest has been the suppression of drunkenness rather than

the industrial effects. There is now a measure before the national legislature for establishing a national bank, and this is causing some newspaper discussion. All these are enterprises of the national government.

In the cantons and in the cities there are movements of a similar character. Various cantons and communes have in recent years assumed the burden of burying the dead. They give to all, rich and poor, the same sort of a burial, which is simple and inexpensive. They permit inequalities in life, but are equal in death. The government burial is not usually made compulsory, but our Consul General reports that where it has been adopted it becomes practically universal.

While I was in Geneva the city gained possession of the lighting plant of an outlying district which had previously been in the hands of a company. In my former letter I told you that wherever there was a new building there were smokestacks near, but in Geneva I saw much new building and almost an entire absence of smokestacks. A few years ago the city began to utilize the power of the Rhone river, which comes out of the lake in a mighty torrent. They needed the water of the lake in their streets and houses, and they made the river pump the water. The watch industry was languishing on account of competition with the machine-made watch in America and elsewhere. The city corporation developed a system for distributing power to the local manufacturers through the pressure of water pumped from the Rhone by the Rhone. This gave a great stimulus to many industries, and more and more power was demanded. When experience had demonstrated the economy of electricity as an agency for lighting and for the distribution of power the city gained possession of all electrical appliances and attached them to their mill on the Rhone. By all these demands the power of the river as developed within the city limits was exhausted, and the demand for power to be used in manufacture was rapidly increasing. To meet the new demand the city government secured a site four miles down the river, where they have constructed a dam of stone which

appears as permanent as Niagara Falls, and where they get an immense head of water. This new mill is now nearing completion. From it power will be distributed by electricity and sold to small manufacturers in the city and suburbs. On my return to the city from my visit to the new mill I rode with a manufacturer from Zurich. He said that their company bought power from a private company and that they paid \$3 for power which costs the Genevese manufacturer only \$2.

Thus you see that the building of new houses and the absence of smokestacks are satisfactorily accounted for. But as before stated the surprising thing about the matter is the cool and matter-of-fact way in which the government enters upon these various industrial undertakings. A few days before I left Geneva the city government voted to build at once twelve tenement houses to be owned and operated by the city. It was understood that this was only the beginning of an enterprise which admitted of infinite expansion. Yet it excited no more comment than would the announcement of a vote to build a schoolhouse. If the people did not like it they could have demanded the *referendum* and have stopped it. Yet, so far as I know, no one thought of such a thing.

From one end of Switzerland to the other there does not seem to be any son of Jay Gould who is ready to stand up and announce in an oracular manner that he believes the interference of the government in their industrial undertaking tends to promote socialism. There is probably no part of Europe where the socialists are having so hard a time as in Switzerland. I found no one in Switzerland who expressed any sympathy for socialism except a Zurich chemist who while a student in Berlin had enjoyed the personal acquaintance of the Socialist Bebel. All the other Swiss with whom I conversed on the topic either knew nothing about it or were opposed to it. The subject seemed to bore them. The idea that the utilizing of the power of the Rhone by the city government for the equal advantage of all the citizens tended to promote socialism seemed to the Genevese utterly ridiculous. They have no intention of surrendering their

individualism. They manifest not the least fear that by some hocus-pocus they will be inveigled into the doing of something by means of their governmental agencies which will interfere with their individual interests. This seems the more remarkable to an American when we remember that the Swiss have no constitutional checks, in the American sense. They have no courts which stand ready at every turn to act as a special providence to prevent the people from embarking in dangerous enterprises. The Swiss know that if they wanted to adopt a communistic form of government they could do so at any moment. There are, however, convinced socialists in Switzerland, and while their doctrines are neither feared nor approved, yet the socialists themselves are treated with the respect due to ordinary patriotic citizens. They are elected to office and admitted to a share in the government.

There is nothing which seems so completely to take the spirit out of a socialist as to treat him as a gentleman and a Christian. What with the socialistic legislation which bankers and manufacturers have inaugurated, and with the kindly treatment on the part of the voters and the general lack of interest in their peculiar teachings, the case of the socialist is indeed pitiable. To avoid extinction some of the Swiss socialists have proposed radical changes in the socialistic doctrine and the methods of action. I have before me an account of a meeting of socialists held in Berne as reported in the *Geneva Journal* of January 3, the article is entitled "*Un nouveau socialisme.*" It contains the resolutions adopted on the occasion and an extract from a speech made by M. Gschwind. The resolutions definitely repudiate a part of the socialistic programme of 1888. Specifically they attack the proposition to monopolize the land on the part of the state. This they say would take away from the farmers their indispensable independence and deliver them into the hands of an expensive bureaucracy. In place of the former doctrine they would substitute the appropriation of ground rents. They also object in general terms to the centralizing tendency of the older socialism, and they would be less definite in the asser-

tion of the necessity on the part of the state to monopolize all the means of production.

The speech delivered in support of the resolutions reveals the fact that these new socialists expect to be viewed with disfavor by the older socialists. Yet they plead for the right of free discussion and private judgment, and they contend that believers in the doctrine of evolution ought to concede the right to change one's opinions. They would, however, have their brethren understand that they are just as good socialists as ever. If they are less definite than other socialists as to the right of the state to exploit *things* they will allow no one to surpass them in their efforts to prevent the exploitation of *men*. This, they say, is what constitutes the socialist, and for the attainment of this they are ready for a union of heart and hands, etc.

These new Swiss socialists seem to be much in the same predicament as was a congress of English clergymen assembled at Wolverhampton in 1887. They had asked Mr. Champion the socialist to address them, and custom required them to pass a resolution on the subject. So they *resolved* that "with the objects and aims of socialism they were in hearty sympathy." Now the object and aim of socialism is to better the condition of mankind, and it takes a mighty mean man not to be in favor of that. And as to this new definition of socialism surely Herbert Spencer himself will not allow any new upstart of a socialist to surpass him in dogmatizing against the exploitation of men on the part of the state. So in Switzerland the socialists have met the enemy (reasonably fairminded bankers and manufacturers) and if the socialists are not theirs, it is difficult to see whose they are or "where they are at."

When, a few years ago, the socialists secured a vote on the proposition to adopt a measure declaring it to be the duty of the state to furnish employment to the unemployed they were overwhelmingly defeated, yet it is probable that a large number voted for the measure who are not socialists. The conservative people in the towns and cities are accustomed to act in harmony with the spirit of this socialistic vote. The city governments make

definite plans to give employment to laborers during the season when there is a lack of employment elsewhere. This was one object which the government of Geneva had in view in entering upon the business of constructing tenement houses. If this business is left to the chance of private enterprise there will naturally be less regard for that most desirable item of continuous employment. Some of the cities have also established official boards to coöperate with private organizations to facilitate uniform employment.

This sort of official conduct, to our minds, naturally suggests paternalism. But this is a subject of which the Swiss seem hopelessly ignorant. There is no word to express the idea, and the idea itself seems wholly lacking. Their idea of democracy excludes paternalism. How all the people acting together or through their own chosen agents can be paternal is something they entirely fail to comprehend. I found a university professor who knew the term as applied to monarchy but he regarded its application to democracy as irrelevant.

JESSE MACY.

PARIS, FRANCE.